



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/629,038

07/28/2003

Mallik Bulusu

042390.P16118

7385

45209 7590 04/01/2008

INTEL/BLAKELY
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

LEMMA, SAMSON B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/629,038	Applicant(s) BULUSU ET AL.	
	Examiner Samson B. Lemma	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17-20, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-14 and 17-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on November 26, 2007. Except independent claim 1, the rest of the independent **claims namely claims 11, 12, 17-18 are** amended. Claims 15-16 and 21-22 are canceled and claims 23-32 are withdrawn from consideration. Thus claims **1-14, 17-20 and 33-34** are pending/examined.
2. In the pervious office action Examiner objected **Claims 15-16 and 21-22** as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
 - Claim 16 is canceled and incorporated into **independent Claim 11.**
 - Claim 15 is canceled and the limitations of Claim 11, from which claim 12 depends, and the limitations of Claim 15, which depends from Claim 12, **have been incorporated into Claim 12.**
 - Claim 22 is canceled and the limitations of claim is incorporated **into independent Claim 17.**
 - The limitations of Claim 17, from which Claim 18 depends, and the limitations of Claim 22, which

Art Unit: 2132

depends from Claim 18, have **been incorporated into Claim 18.**

Priority

3. This application does not claim priority of an application. Therefore, the effective filing data for the subject matter defined in the pending claims of this application is **07/28/2003.**

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims **11-14 and 17-20** regarding the 102(a) rejection have been considered but are moot in view of allowance.

The 112 rejection set forth in the previous office action is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the **claims 1-10 and 33-34** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the 102 (a) rejection set forth to the **claims 1-10 and 33-34**, the examiner counters that a careful reading of **Rokov** reveals that feature that is argued is disclosed by the reference.

In order to show how each and every limitation of the independent claim 1 is disclosed by the reference on the record the examiner would show the following.

For instance,

Referring to the independent claim 1, Rokov the art on the record discloses an article comprising: a machine-readable storage medium having a plurality of machine accessible instructions, which if executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:

- **Registering one or more capabilities with a central repository;** [figure 1, see “CIM Repository”/or CIMOM Repository indicated on page 4, second column , 1st paragraph]
- **Determining if one or more capabilities associated with a blade device match a capability policy; and if the blade device capabilities do not match the capability policy, isolating the blade device from a computing domain.** [See on page 4, first column, and last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph] (ON page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph, it has been disclosed that depending on the automated policies that have been configured, the CMM sends an IPMI command to power on the spare blade. It also sends any extra information about a failed blade, re-configures the network switch to put the new blade in the active configuration and using IPMI commands, turns on the visual indicators on the failed blade (to be diagnosed/repaired offline). The BMC on the new blade

communicates performance and other relevant data back to the CMM. Any updated information is then reflected back in the CIMOM Repository and this meets the recitation of the claim limitation)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. **Claims 1-10 and 33-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **an article written on Computer Technology Review, by Steve Rokov** (hereinafter referred as **Rokov**)(See reference U) (Published on June 2003)
7. **As per claim 1** Rokov discloses an article comprising: a **machine-readable storage medium having a plurality of machine accessible instructions, which if executed by a machine, cause the machine to perform operations comprising:**
 - **Registering one or more capabilities with a central repository;** [figure 1, see “CIM Respository”/or CIMOM Respository indicated on page 4, second column , 1st paragraph]
 - **Determining if one or more capabilities associated with a blade device match a capability policy; and if the blade device capabilities do not match the capability policy, isolating the blade device from a computing domain.** [See on page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph] (ON

page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph, it has been disclosed that depending on the automated policies that have been configured, the CMM sends an IPMI command to power on the spare blade. It also sends any extra information about a failed blade, re-configures the network switch to put the new blade in the active configuration and using IPMI commands, turns on the visual indicators on the failed blade (to be diagnosed/repaired offline). The BMC on the new blade communicates performance and other relevant data back to the CMM. Any updated information is then reflected back in the CIMOM Respository and this meets the recitation of the claim limitation)

8. **As per claim 2 Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system**, further comprising: a data communication pathway coupled to the blade device and to the chassis management logic. [See figure 4]
9. **As per claims 3 and 33-34 Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system, wherein: the chassis management logic is further to isolate the blade device from a computing domain responsive to determining that the blade device capabilities do not match the capability**

- policy.** [See on page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph] (ON page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph, it has been disclosed that depending on the automated policies that have been configured, the CMM sends an IPMI command to power on the spare blade. It also sends any extra information about a failed blade, re-configures the network switch to put the new blade in the active configuration and using IPMI commands, turns on the visual indicators on the failed blade (to be diagnosed/repaired offline). The BMC on the new blade communicates performance and other relevant data back to the CMM. Any updated information is then reflected back in the CIMOM Respository and this meets the recitation of the claim limitation)
10. **As per claims 4-6, Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system, further comprising: a plurality of blade devices; wherein each of the plurality of blade devices is coupled to the data communication pathway [See figure 4]; and wherein the chassis management logic is further to determine, for at least one of the plurality of blade devices, whether blade capabilities associated with the at least one blade device match the capability policy.** [See on page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph] (ON

Art Unit: 2132

page 4, first column, last paragraph up to second column 1st paragraph, it has been disclosed that depending on the automated policies that have been configured, the CMM sends an IPMI command to power on the spare blade. It also sends any extra information about a failed blade, re-configures the network switch to put the new blade in the active configuration and using IPMI commands, turns on the visual indicators on the failed blade (to be diagnosed/repaired offline). The BMC on the new blade communicates performance and other relevant data back to the CMM. Any updated information is then reflected back in the CIMOM Respository and this meets the recitation of the claim limitation)

11. **As per claim 7 Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system, further comprising:** a baseboard memory controller, wherein the baseboard memory controller is to control communication between the blade device and the chassis management logic. [See figure 1 and 4]
12. **As per claims 8-9 Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system,** wherein: the blade device includes logic to perform boot processing. [See page 2]

Art Unit: 2132

13. **As per claims 10 Rokov discloses the method/system/ an article as applied to claims above. Furthermore Rokov discloses the method/system**, further comprising: a chassis to receive the blade device. [See figure 4, Blade Chassis and Blades]

Allowable Subject Matter

14. **Claims 11-14 and 17-20 are allowed.**

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samson B Lemma whose telephone number is 571-272-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am---4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BARRON JR GILBERTO can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Samson B Lemma/

Examiner, Art Unit 2132

03/10/2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132